



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,575	07/02/2003	William A. Montemer	ICHGP006	4267
21912	7590	06/19/2006		
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP 10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014				
			EXAMINER MYINT, DENNIS Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,575	Applicant(s) MONTEMER, WILLIAM A.	
	Examiner Dennis Myint	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/02/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on 02 May 2006.
2. Claims 2-21 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 17, and 20 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on 02 May 2006, 2-21 are added and claim 1 was cancelled. This office action is made final.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 02 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as follows. This office action is made final.

Applicant argues that *Desmond and Hanson neither singularly nor in combination teach the limitations of claim 2* (Applicant's argument, Page 6). Taking said argument into consideration, new grounds of rejection are introduced as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2162

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-5, 17-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung et al. (hereinafter "Cheung") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0169760) in view of Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0024491).

Referring to claim 2, Cheung teaches the limitations:

A method, comprising:

"receiving one or more bid amounts for a keyword, wherein each bid amount is associated with a listing" (Paragraph 0025, Paragraph 0104, and Paragraphs 0091-0093);

"returning one or more listings responsive to a query associated with the keyword, wherein the listings are organized in an order associated with the respective bid amounts of the responsive listings" (Paragraphs 0028 and 0106) ; and

"receiving an indication that a selected listing included in the responsive listings has been selected" (Paragraphs 0104-0105);

Cheung does not explicitly disclose the limitation:

"crediting to an entity that received a corresponding bid amount of the selected listing from an advertiser, a portion less than the full amount of the corresponding selected listing bid amount" .

Walker teaches the limitation:

"crediting to an entity that received a corresponding bid amount of the selected listing from an advertiser, a portion less than the full amount of the corresponding selected listing bid amount" (Paragraph 0019). Walker teaches revenue sharing among content providers and service providers. Therefore, part of the full amount is credited to a partner of the revenue sharing plan (i.e., an entity that received a corresponding bid amount of the selected listing from an advertiser), which is obviously less than the full amount of the corresponding listing bid amount.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Cheung with the feature of revenue sharing as taught by Walker so that the combined method would comprise crediting to an entity that received a corresponding bid amount of the selected listing from an advertiser, a portion less than the full amount of the corresponding selected listing bid amount. One would have been motivated to do so in order because revenue sharing among good/services provides by pooling goods and services is a well known business practice.

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected on the same basis as claim 2.

Referring to claim 3, Walker teaches the limitation:

"further comprising crediting to a provider that returned the local business listings responsive to the query a portion less than the full amount of the corresponding

selected listing bid amount” (Paragraph 0019). Walker teaches revenue sharing among content providers and service providers.

Claim 18 and 21 are rejected on the same basis as claim 3.

Referring to claim 4, Walker teaches the limitation:

“wherein addition of the portion credited to the entity and the portion credited to the provider equals the full amount of the corresponding selected listing bid amount” (Paragraph 0019). Walker teaches revenue sharing among content providers and service providers.

Referring to claim 5, Cheung teaches the limitation:

“wherein the listing is one or more of the following: a directory assistance listing and a local business listing” (Paragraph 0014-0015 and 0091).

6. Claim 6-7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung in view of Walker and further in view of Reichardt et al. (hereinafter “Reichardt”) (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0124255).

Referring to claim 6, Cheung in view of Walker does not explicitly teach the limitation: “wherein at least one of the one or more bid amounts is based at least in part on a time value”.

Reichardt teaches the limitation: “wherein at least one of the one or more bid amounts is based at least in part on a time value” (Paragraph 0086 and 0090).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of listings based on time-slots as taught by Reichardt to the method of Cheung in view of Walker so that in the resultant method bid amount for listings will be based on a time value. One would have been motivated to do so in order to enhance advertising and merchandising opportunities (Reichardt, Paragraph 0009).

Claim 19 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Referring to claim 7, Reichardt teaches the limitation:

"wherein the time value is associated with a time at which a corresponding listing is selected" (Paragraph 0086 and 0090).

7. Claim 8-10, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung in view of Walker and further in view of Bedingfield SR (hereinafter "Bedingfield") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0260604).

Referring to claim 8, Cheung in view of Walker does not explicitly disclose the limitation: "wherein at least one of the one or more bid amounts is based at least in part on a distance value".

Bedingfield teaches the limitation:

"wherein at least one of the one or more bid amounts is based at least in part on a distance value" (Figure 5, Paragraph 0008-0009 and 0021, i.e. *The selected one or*

more advertiser entries may be presented based on at least in part on the user measured location information and the advertiser measured location information of the selected one or more advertiser entries.).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of listings based on distances as taught by Bedingfield to the method of Cheung in view of Walker so that the resultant method would also comprise bid amounts which are based at least in part on a distance value. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide location-based services (Bedingfield, Paragraph 0005).

Referring to claim 9, Bedingfield teaches the limitation:

“wherein the distance value is associated with the distance between a location associated with a listing and a location associated with one or more of the following: the query, a user of the query, and the provider” (Figure 5, Paragraph 0008-0009 and 0021, i.e. *The selected one or more advertiser entries may be presented based on at least in part on the user measured location information and the advertiser measured location information of the selected one or more advertiser entries.).*

Referring to claim 10, Bedingfield teaches the limitation:

“wherein the listings are responsive to the query only if the listings are associated with a location within a distance value from a location associated with one or more of the following: the query, a user of the query, and the provider” (Paragraphs 0021-0025).

Referring claim 14, Bedingfield is directed to the limitation:

“wherein query is associated with an interactive voice response system”

(Paragraph 0004).

8. Claim 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung in view of Walker and further in view of Ponte (U.S. Patent Number 7047242).

Referring to claim 11, Cheung in view of Walker does not explicitly teach the limitation: “wherein receiving the one or more bid amounts for the keyword includes synchronizing a shared database with one or more databases of one or more entities from which the one or bid amounts are received.”

Ponte teaches the limitation:

“wherein receiving the one or more bid amounts for the keyword includes synchronizing a shared database with one or more databases of one or more entities from which the one or bid amounts are received” (Figure 4, Column 5 Line 59 through Column 6 Line 41, Figure 31, Column 57 Lines 7-17, and Column 60 Lines 51-56).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of a shared database which is connected to one or more databases for business listings as taught by Ponte to the method of Cheung in view of Walker so that the resultant method would comprise receiving the one or more bid amounts for the keyword includes synchronizing a shared database with one or more databases of one or more entities from which the one or bid amounts

Art Unit: 2162

are received. One would have been motivated to do so in order to target a wide range of users who may be interested in a wide range of goods and services (Ponte, Column 1 Lines 3-36).

Referring to claim 12, Official Note is taken that the concept of synchronizing databases periodically is notoriously well known in the art.

Referring to claim 13, Ponte is direct to the limitation:

“wherein the databases of entities includes at least two databases of different formats that synchronize with the same shared-database” (Ponte, Figure 4).

9. Claim 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung in view of Walker and further in view of Tibbetts (U.S. Patent Number 6158044).

Referring to claim 15, Cheung in view of Walker does not explicitly teach the limitation: “wherein crediting to the entity includes placing transaction data in a queue”.

Tibbetts teaches the limitation:

“wherein crediting to the entity includes placing transaction data in a queue” (Column 10 Lines 13-16).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of transaction queuing as taught by Tibbetts to

Art Unit: 2162

the method of Cheung in view of Walker so that the resultant method would comprise transaction queuing. One would have been motivated to do so simply because transaction queuing is well known in the art.

Referring to claim 16, Tibbetts teaches the limitation:

“wherein the transaction data is associated with a metadata that can be used to recover the crediting from a failure” (Column 11 Line 20 through Column 12 Line 16 and Column 25 Lines 10-20).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint

AU-2162


Cam y Tuong.
primary Examiner